

*** NOTE: TO RETURN TO THIS PAGE, CLICK ON THE COUNTY SEAL ***

[CLICK HERE FOR THE CEO's REPORT DATED JULY 26, 2007](#)

[CLICK HERE FOR THE CEO's REPORT DATED AUGUST 15, 2007](#)



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

July 26, 2007

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

JOINT MOTION BY SUPERVISORS MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH AND ZEV YAROSLAVSKY – REGISTERED NURSE RECLASSIFICATION PROCESS

On May 8, 2007, your Board approved a joint motion by Supervisors Michael D. Antonovich and Zev Yaroslavsky for the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to evaluate and report on how the Registered Nurse (RN) reclassification process has worked, if any adjustments need to be made, and the implications the RN reclassification has had for handling future large scale reclassifications.

Following this motion, we requested specific information from each department that employs RNs to evaluate the progress of the reclassification process. Through these inquiries, we found that the reclassification process occurred as anticipated in each department, with the exception of the Department of Health Services (DHS).

In DHS, several issues related to the reclassification process were of concern to us. For example:

- 1) The number of RNs who had been reclassified to the higher level RN positions was markedly lower than the department's allocation (the department was allocated approximately 2,100 RN II and RN III positions, but had only promoted approximately 500);
- 2) rumors were circulating among RNs that nurse managers were making reclassification decisions that were contrary to our negotiated settlement(s); and

- 3) most importantly, we found major discrepancies in following the Civil Service Rules in the process administered by the department.

Under Civil Service Rules, the RN reclassification process had to include a promotional examination process for the RN II and RN III positions. To ensure that the integrity of the Civil Service process remained protected, we officially requested the Department of Human Resources (DHR) to conduct a full audit of DHS' administration of the RN II and RN III examination processes.

DHR began their audit of the exam process at DHS on June 4, 2007, and completed the audit on June 15, 2007. Once the full audit was completed, a meeting was held with DHR, CEO, Dr. Chernof and other DHS administrators to determine the appropriate action(s) and timeline needed to correct the examination deficiencies.

On June 28, 2007, a meeting was held with Local 721 representatives where the findings of DHR's audit and DHS' plan of action was discussed. Union representatives expressed gratitude for the leadership of the department for remaining committed to the intent of the negotiated reclassification process and felt that the corrective action plan represented a better effort to reach desired goals.

Since our inquiries did not reveal any examination discrepancies in other departments who employ RNs, we did not request a full audit of the processes used by the other departments. However, DHR is reviewing the use of the RN II and RN III promotional eligible list in the Department of Public Health. It is unknown at this time if any discrepancies or further actions will be required.

The review of the RN reclassification process has shed some light on how future large scale reclassifications should be handled. Specifically, DHS currently has a reclassification of the Respiratory Care Practitioner series pending. Incumbent employees who are currently performing the duties of a Respiratory Care Practitioner must be reclassified into new classifications recently approved under ordinance by your Board. Under Civil Service Rules, the process for the reclassification of these incumbents is very similar, if not identical to that of the RNs (i.e., a promotional examination will be required).

The RN reclassification experience has resulted in DHS being more vigilant in ensuring that the appropriate staff is properly trained in the exam process under Civil Service Rules. The department has implemented a check and balance process that will make sure that managers appropriately follow the rules and have learned that they can rely on the expertise of DHR if or when a Civil Service related question arises.

ADVIS: 10/11/78

13-00000 3/11/2011 10:00 AM

1. *Phragmites australis* (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud.

The experience of the RN process will aid in ensuring that the Respiratory Care Practitioner, and any future reclassification processes in DHS, will proceed smoothly and seamlessly.

As the County continues to implement large scale reclassifications, such as the Information Technology series, the experiences of both the RN reclassification and the Respiratory Care Practitioner exams will be beneficial in determining where improvement in said processes must be made. It is our objective that future reclassifications will produce outcomes with minimal disruption and apprehension to impacted employees.

If you have any questions or need further information, please contact Jim Adams of my Employee Relations staff at (213) 974-2404.

WTF:DL:JA
RM:rld

c: Dr. Bruce Chernof, DHS
Dr. Jonathan E. Fielding, DPH
Leroy D. Baca, LASD
Michael J. Henry, DHR
Sachi Hamai, Executive Office, B of S
Raymond G. Fortner, County Counsel
Annelle Grajeda, Local 721



County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

August 15, 2007

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY NEEDS AND POTENTIAL ON-SITE TRAINING AT COUNTY FACILITIES

On May 8, 2007, your Board directed the Chief Executive Office (CEO), Department of Human Resources (DHR) and Chief Information Office (CIO) to identify the specific Information Technology (IT) needs of the County workforce and determine whether it would be beneficial to establish an on-site training program at County facilities, and report back in 60 days. Additional time was required to compile and analyze the IT survey results, and an extension was granted until August 15, 2007.

This memorandum provides the results of a survey of County departments on IT training needs and recommends establishing a County IT Training Advisory Body to evaluate strategies to better meet these needs.

Background

The County currently supports and provides IT training for both IT professionals and nonprofessionals by offering:

- Tuition reimbursement to employees who attend technical training courses;
- Technical training through many academic learning institutions; and
- Vendor software training through the County of Los Angeles Learning Academy.

The County will also offer on-line, vendor-provided technical training financed through the SEIU local 721 Labor Management Training Committee for their represented

employees. This includes approximately 1,600 employees and over 30 IT classifications. The training will be deployed and tracked through the Los Angeles County Learning Net, our new learning management system.

The CIO developed an IT survey that was distributed on-line to all departmental IT managers and departmental Administrative Deputies to assess departmental technology training requirements at a high level. Over 35 departments responded to the survey and the results indicated that they would find value in the County providing on-site technical training at selected County facilities. However, the types of training, curriculum and course delivery channels varied due to diverse departmental training requirements.

Specific Information Technology Needs of the County Workforce

The survey results identified the following specific County IT needs:

- **On-site training** - County departments that responded to the survey indicated that they would be interested in a County-sponsored on-site training program, whether on-line or in a classroom environment.
- **County training sites** - Over 90 percent of County departments do not have on-site training classrooms or equipment at their facility.
- **Types of training** - Departments are interested in high quality, short, concentrated technical training programs.
- **Vendor or private institutions** - Over 85 percent of County departments surveyed supported using local community colleges to provide training. The preferred training delivery channels were vendors and specialized private institutions.
- **Instructor-led courses** - The courses which were reported most valuable to meet their needs were the following:
 1. Web Projects
 2. Oracle, SQL and PL/SQL
 3. XML Programming
 4. Cisco Networking
- **Delivery** - Over 60 percent of departments surveyed reported that the best delivery approach for on-site IT training would be training provided during work hours.

Benefits of an Information Technology Training Program

- A County IT training program will enhance the skills of the County's workforce and will be aligned with the County's Strategic Plan Goals of Workforce Excellence and Organizational Effectiveness.
- IT training strengthens the County's competitiveness with other local governments and the private sector, and will improve recruitment and retention.

Recommendations

Based on our review of the IT survey results, we make the following recommendations:

- Departments have various IT needs which are often urgent and business driven. Therefore, we recommend utilizing vendors/private institutions or contractors to provide training, as they could accommodate specialty needs quickly and on an individual basis. Further, for those long-term needs that can be identified, we can explore contract delivery opportunities on County premises for those departments that have enrollment interest.
- Create a Countywide IT Training Advisory Board consisting of the CEO, CIO, DHR, and departmental IT representatives. This advisory body would be charged with working with departments to identify common required IT skill sets and developing cost-effective training strategies to build competencies in these skill sets. One of the opportunities that this body will be evaluating is leveraging the Countywide purchase agreement administered by DHR to acquire additional licenses to offer on-line technical training to non-represented County IT professionals.

Unless otherwise instructed, this office will work with the CIO and the DHR to establish an IT Training Advisory Body to further evaluate department IT training needs and develop strategies to meet those needs.

Please let me know if you have any questions, or your staff may contact Lisa Nuñez at (213) 974-1163.

WTF:LN:SK
VIC:dc

c: Chief Information Officer
Director of Personnel